



## Department of Environmental Quality

# **CONSOLIDATED CHECKLIST FOR LOCAL CHESAPEAKE BAY PRESERVATION ACT PROGRAM COMPLIANCE REVIEW**

**Locality:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date Review Initiated:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date Review Completed:** \_\_\_\_\_

Among the powers and duties of the State Water Control Board outlined in § 62.1-44.15:69 of the Code of Virginia is the charge to “[t]ake administrative and legal actions to ensure compliance by counties, cities and towns with the provisions of this chapter including the proper enforcement and implementation of, and continual compliance with, this chapter.” The *Consolidated Checklist for Local Program Compliance Review* is intended to facilitate the review process.

The *Consolidated Checklist* is used by DEQ staff as a tool for evaluating a number of local program elements required by § 62.1-44.15.69 of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (Act) and § 9VAC25-830-260 of the *Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations* (Regulations). The checklist is intended to be completed by DEQ staff, based on information and materials provided by locality staff.

The *Consolidated Checklist* consists of five review parts:

- Elements of the Local Program
- Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation Criteria
- Land Use and Development Performance Criteria
- Local Program Administration and Enforcement
- Site Plan Review and Field Investigations

**PART I****Elements of the Local Program (§ 9 VAC25-830-60)**

---

The *Regulations* require local governments to “develop measures...necessary to comply with the Act and this Chapter.” Among the measures that are required to be in place at the local level are the elements listed in § 9VAC25-830-60. These elements are to be examined for consistency with previous Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Board (Board) approvals; to determine if changes to the program element have been made but not yet reviewed; and, evaluated to determine how each element is used in administering the local Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act program.

**A. Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Map - § 9VAC25-830-60 1**

1. Does DEQ have a digital and/or hard copy of this CBPA Map?  
 Digital ☐ Hard copy ☐  
 If DEQ does not have a copy of the most current CBPA map, one must be obtained.
2. When was the CBPA map approved by CBLAB? \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is the date of the most current version of the locally adopted CBPA Map?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
4. Have there been amendments or revisions to the map that require DEQ approval that have not received that approval?  
 Yes ☐ No ☐  
 If “Yes”, list them: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Is the map a general representation of CBPA lands, or is the CPBA map used as the final determining factor of CBPA locations? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Is the RMA shown on the map? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Are revisions to the CBPA map incorporated into the Plan of Development review process such that applicants are provided the most current information possible on the general location of CBPA lands?  
 Yes ☐ No ☐
7. Do updates to the CBPA map require local Board or Council approval?  
 Yes ☐ No ☐
8. Are there any inconsistencies between the map and the local CBPA ordinance?  
 Yes ☐ No ☐  
 If “Yes”, list them: \_\_\_\_\_

9. At a minimum, are the streams and adjacent RPAs shown on the CBPA map based on stream features as shown on the most recent USGS map, or other scientifically valid method?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
If "No", explain: \_\_\_\_\_
10. If the locality includes "other lands" in its RPA designation what constitutes these "other lands"? \_\_\_\_\_  
Are they depicted on the CBPA map?  
Yes ☐ No ☐
11. Do the map, the ordinance, and the local review processes result in accurate determinations of the limits of CBPAs in relation to development projects?  
Yes ☐ No ☐

**B. Comprehensive Plan - § 9VAC25-830-60 3**

1. Which locally adopted documents include the required Comprehensive Plan elements (e.g. a land use plan, utilities plan, policy plan, capital improvements plan, etc.)? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Does the Comprehensive Plan include all the local Phase II elements as approved by the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Board for that locality?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
If "Yes", are the Plan revisions identical to what was previously approved? Or do the revisions retain the same general concepts, with no substantive changes? \_\_\_\_\_  
If the answer is "No" and there are significant differences between the current Plan and what was previously approved, explain: \_\_\_\_\_
3. What were the local dates of approval/adoption of these documents? \_\_\_\_\_
4. When were the required Comprehensive Plan elements found consistent by the Board?  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. The Regulation requires that, "as a minimum, the comprehensive plan or plan component shall consist of the following basic elements: (i) a summary of data collection; (ii) analysis and policy discussion(s); (iii) land use plan map(s); and (iv) implementing measures, including specific objectives and a time frame for accomplishment." Does the Plan contain current data, mapping, and information in the following areas to facilitate development of Plan policy and implementing measures regarding the impact of land use on water quality in CBPAs, as applicable?  
Yes ☐ No ☐ Physical constraints to development (soil survey, floodplain mapping), including a discussion of the relationship between soil limitations and existing and proposed land use, with an explicit discussion of soil suitability for septic tank use.

Locality:

Yes ☐ No ☐ Protection of potable water supply, including groundwater resources and threats to the water supply or groundwater resources from existing and potential pollution sources

Yes ☐ No ☐ Shoreline and streambank erosion control (VIMS shoreline studies, etc.)

Yes ☐ No ☐ Public and private access to waterfront areas, including general locations of or information about docks, piers, marinas, boat ramps, and similar water access facilities; policies for the future siting of docks and piers, and their effect on water quality.

Yes ☐ No ☐ Character and location of commercial and recreational fisheries and other aquatic resources

Yes ☐ No ☐ Existing and proposed land uses, and mitigation of the impacts of land use and its associated pollution on water quality

Yes ☐ No ☐ Catalog of existing and potential water pollution sources, and potential water quality improvement through their reduction

Yes ☐ No ☐ Potential water quality improvement through the reduction of existing pollution sources, and the redevelopment of IDAs and other areas targeted for redevelopment

If "No" to any of the above, describe any specific new information, the policy area(s) it covers and the local schedule for revising the Plan to include this new information.

\_\_\_\_\_

6. Has the locality provided a report on how they address the following components of the Comprehensive Plan?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If "Yes", does the report include information regarding the following issues?

Yes ☐ No ☐ How the locality ensures plan policies are reviewed and updated as needed to ensure they remain current

Yes ☐ No ☐ How the locality identifies revisions to plan elements that conflict with Bay Act plan policies or elements

Yes ☐ No ☐ How the locality addresses implementing measures identified in the Bay Act plan elements

Yes ☐ No ☐ Status of local implementation of Bay Act plan elements

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

If "No", what is the locality's schedule for providing an implementation status report?

\_\_\_\_\_

**C. Current CBPA Ordinances - §§ 9VAC25-830-60 4, 5, and 6**

1. What ordinances contain the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area performance criteria listed under § 9 VAC25-830-120? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Have there been any amendments to these ordinances since the time of the last compliance evaluation that require DEQ approval that have not yet received that approval?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
If “Yes”, list the amendment revisions and the local adoption dates of each: \_\_\_\_\_
3. What ordinances were reviewed during the \_\_\_\_\_ (insert date) Advisory Review?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Did the \_\_\_\_\_ (insert date) Advisory Review report note the absence of any applicable plan and plat requirements? (§§ 9VAC25-830-190 4 and 5)  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
If “Yes”, did the locality adopt ordinance provisions to address the identified deficiencies?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
Date of adoption: \_\_\_\_\_  
If “Yes”, does the locality implement the required plan and plat notations?  
Yes ☐ No ☐

**PART II**

**Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation Criteria (§ 9VAC25-830-80;  
§ 9VAC25-830-90; § 9VAC25-830-100 and § 9VAC25-830-110)**

---

The questions in this section evaluate local government designation of the components of the local Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas.

**A. Resource Protection Area**

1. Does the locality’s adopted CBPA ordinance include all required features in the designation of Resource Protection Areas?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
Ordinance citation: \_\_\_\_\_  
CBPA Map adoption date: \_\_\_\_\_  
If “Yes”, check all that are applicable.  
☐ Tidal wetlands  
☐ Tidal shores  
☐ Connected and contiguous nontidal wetlands  
☐ 100-foot buffer

Locality:

2. Does the locality have an expanded or variable width RPA buffer?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
If "Yes", describe the components and/or width of the RPA buffer: \_\_\_\_\_  
Ordinance citation: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Does the locality appropriately require a Perennial Flow Determination (or another reliable site-specific evaluation) be carried out as part of their Plan of Development process?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
If "Yes", are the findings from such determinations incorporated into the locality's CBPA map?  
Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Describe the local process for ensuring on-site determinations of water bodies with perennial flow and connected and contiguous non-tidal wetlands are carried out. Include a description of submittal requirements and any required documentation for purposes of the local review.  
Description: \_\_\_\_\_  
Documentation required: \_\_\_\_\_
5. As indicated during the file and plan review process, does the locality require the site specific delineation of the RPA boundaries through its plan of development review process and WQIA review process, per § 9VAC25-830-110?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_  
If the issue has not arisen, does the locality have a process for addressing the required site-specific evaluations?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

## **B. Resource Management Area**

1. If the local RMA designation does not include all remaining land in the Chesapeake Bay watershed or in the local jurisdiction, what is the RMA designation? (Check any that apply.)
- |                          |                               |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Entire jurisdiction _____     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Entire watershed _____        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Linear setback from RPA _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Special features _____        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Whole lot inclusion _____     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other _____                   |
- What was the original CBLAB approved RMA? \_\_\_\_\_

## **C. Intensely Developed Area**

1. Does the locality have any designated (mapped) IDAs?

Locality:

Yes ☐ No ☐

Ordinance citation: \_\_\_\_\_

If "Yes", when did the CBLAB approve the IDA designation? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Have there been any changes to the locally-designated IDA?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If "Yes", have these changes been approved by DEQ? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Does the locality have policies or procedures for establishing a vegetative buffer in IDAs over time?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Describe policies or procedures: \_\_\_\_\_

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

### **PART III**

#### **Land Use and Development Performance Criteria (§ 9VAC25-830-130)**

---

The questions in this section evaluate implementation of the performance criteria within locally designated Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas. There are specific questions relating to the findings of the Advisory Reviews that were undertaken to catalogue specific provisions to address the three criteria to minimize land disturbance and impervious cover and to preserve existing indigenous vegetation.

##### **A. Minimizing Land Disturbance - § 9VAC25-830-130 1**

1. Using the information from the Advisory Review, summarize the ordinance provisions to ensure that no more land is disturbed than is necessary to provide for the desired use or development?

Provide a summary of the provisions and Ordinance citations: \_\_\_\_\_

2. What adopted policies and procedures does the locality have in place to ensure that no more land is disturbed than is necessary to provide for the desired use or development?

Provide a summary of the policies and procedures: \_\_\_\_\_

Other adopted document(s): \_\_\_\_\_

3. Since the final Advisory Review report of \_\_\_\_\_ (*date of final report*), has the locality adopted additional policies, procedures and/or ordinance provisions to minimize land disturbance?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Describe: \_\_\_\_\_

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

4. What other mechanisms does the locality use to ensure that no more land is disturbed than is necessary to provide for the desired use or development?

Other mechanisms: \_\_\_\_\_

Locality: \_\_\_\_\_

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

Ordinance citations: \_\_\_\_\_

5. As demonstrated by the site plan and file review and subsequent field visits, did the local government implement the applicable ordinance provisions/processes relating to the minimization of land disturbance?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Based on the site plan and file review process and field visits, has the locality adequately demonstrated that they consistently achieve the requirement to minimize land disturbance in all cases?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

## **B. Preserving Indigenous Vegetation - § 9VAC25-130- 2**

1. Using the information from the Advisory Review, summarize the ordinance provisions to ensure that indigenous vegetation is preserved to the maximum extent possible consistent with the use and development permitted?

Provide a summary of the provisions: \_\_\_\_\_

Ordinance citation(s): \_\_\_\_\_

2. What adopted policies and procedures has the locality developed to ensure that indigenous vegetation is preserved to the maximum extent possible consistent with the use and development permitted?

Provide a summary of the policies and procedures: \_\_\_\_\_

Other adopted document(s): \_\_\_\_\_

3. Since the Advisory Review in \_\_\_\_\_ (date of final report), has the locality adopted additional ordinance provisions to preserve indigenous vegetation?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Describe: \_\_\_\_\_

Ordinance citation(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

4. What other mechanisms does the locality use to ensure that indigenous vegetation is preserved to the maximum extent possible consistent with the use and development allowed?

Other mechanisms: \_\_\_\_\_

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

5. As demonstrated by the site plan and file review and subsequent field visits, did the local government implement all of the applicable ordinance provisions/processes relating to the preservation of indigenous vegetation?



Yes ☐ No ☐  
Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Based on the site plan and file review process and site visits, has the locality adequately demonstrated that they consistently achieve the requirement to preserve indigenous vegetation?

Yes ☐ No ☐  
Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

**C. Plan of Development Review Process - § 9VAC25-830-130 3**

1. Does the locality implement a Plan of Development review process that applies to all development and redevelopment projects that exceed 2,500 square feet of land disturbance?

Yes ☐ No ☐  
Briefly summarize the POD process: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Are there checklists, flowcharts or other documents required or associated with the local Plan of Development review process to ensure the review occurs properly?

Yes ☐ No ☐  
Describe documents: \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Minimizing Impervious Cover - § 9VAC25-830-130 4**

1. Using information from the Advisory Review, summarize the ordinance provisions to ensure that land development minimizes impervious cover consistent with the use and development permitted?

- i. Summary of the provisions: \_\_\_\_\_  
ii. Ordinance citation(s): \_\_\_\_\_

2. Since the Advisory Review in \_\_\_\_\_ (date of final report), has the locality adopted additional ordinance provisions to minimize impervious cover?

- i. Yes ☐ No ☐  
ii. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
iii. Ordinance(s) citation: \_\_\_\_\_  
iv. Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

3. What adopted policies and procedures have the locality developed to ensure that land development minimizes impervious cover consistent with the use and development permitted?

- i. Provide a summary of the policies and procedures: \_\_\_\_\_  
ii. Other adopted document(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Locality:

4. Since the Advisory Review in \_\_\_\_ (date of final report), has the locality adopted additional policies, procedures and/or ordinance provisions to minimize impervious cover?
- i. Yes ☐ No ☐
  - ii. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_
  - iii. Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_
5. What other mechanisms does the locality use to ensure that land development minimizes impervious cover consistent with the use and development permitted?
- i. Other mechanisms: \_\_\_\_\_
  - ii. Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_
6. As demonstrated by the site plan and file review and subsequent field visits, did the local government implement all applicable ordinance provisions/processes relating to the minimization of impervious cover?
- i. Yes ☐ No ☐
  - ii. Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Erosion and Sediment Control Required for 2,500 Square Feet of Land Disturbance - § 9VAC25-830-130-5**

1. Does the locality have an erosion and sediment control program that is applied to land disturbances in excess of 2,500 square feet in CBPAs?
- Yes ☐ No ☐
- If "Yes", has the program been found consistent?
- Yes ☐ No ☐
- If "Yes", list the date of the approval: \_\_\_\_\_
2. If the answer above is "No", is the locality under a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to address ESC program deficiencies?
- Yes ☐ No ☐
- Deadline of CAP: \_\_\_\_\_
3. If the answer above is "No", and the locality is a town, does the town rely on the adjacent county to implement erosion and sediment control requirements?
- Yes ☐ No ☐
- Name of adjacent jurisdiction that implements ESC requirements: \_\_\_\_\_
- Describe the agreement (MOU or other): \_\_\_\_\_

**F. Septic Tank Pump Out Program - § 9VAC25-830-130-7**

1. As referenced in the Annual Report(s) or through other information, how many septic tanks are in the local CBPA?
- \_\_\_\_\_

Locality:

2. How many tanks have been pumped, inspected or had filters installed in the past five years? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Does the locality's CBPA ordinance (or other adopted ordinance provision) permit the inspection and/or plastic filter options in lieu of the five year pump-out?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
If "Yes", which option is allowed?  
☐ Inspection option  
☐ Plastic filter option  
Ordinance citation: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Within the past five years, has the locality notified all applicable septic tank owners of the five year pump-out requirement?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
If "No", what is the schedule for completing notification to all applicable owners?  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. Does the locality have a process to follow-up with property owners who do not pump, inspect or install the plastic filter within the locality deadline?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
If "Yes", briefly describe the process and provide copies of notices, processes, etc.:  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. How many second notices have been sent over the last 12 months (or other specific period of time)? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Has the locality undertaken any enforcement actions for property owners who have not had their septic tank pumped, inspected or had the plastic filter installed?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
Number of enforcement actions: \_\_\_\_\_  
Describe enforcement program: \_\_\_\_\_

**G. Agricultural Requirements - § 9VAC25-830-130-8; § 9VAC25-830-140 5 b**

1. Does the locality have active agricultural lands within its designated CBPA?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Does the locality have a process, in collaboration with the local Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD), to facilitate review and enforcement of the agricultural requirements?  
Yes ☐ No ☐  
Date of the Memorandum of Understanding: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Does the locality have a process, in collaboration with the local SWCD, that outlines a process for addressing agricultural water quality pollution provisions of the Regulations?

Locality:

Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Does the locality's process outline a process for addressing landowners who refuse assistance from SWCD staff?

Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Does the locality have a process whereby enforcement actions and compliance schedules are carried out, in cooperation with the SWCD, for landowners who refuse assistance?

Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Has the locality developed an implementation plan for addressing the requirement to ensure that all active CBPA agricultural lands have a current soil and water quality conservation assessment?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Briefly describe the plan: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Does the locality have a method to track encroachments into the RPA buffer for agricultural activities?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Briefly describe the mechanism or information source: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Does the locality require the re-establishment of the 100' buffer when land is converted from agricultural or silvicultural uses to other uses?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If "Yes", describe the policies or standards for re-vegetation of the RPA buffer for converted lands: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **H. Silvicultural Requirements - § 9VAC25-830-130-9**

1. Does the locality have a mechanism to track forestry operations that are not maintaining the Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) as recommended by VDOF?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Does the locality have a process for addressing lack of adherence to the SMZ when notified by the Virginia Department of Forestry (VDOF) staff?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

3. How many instances of lack of adherence with the SMZ did VDOF report to the locality during the past year?

\_\_\_\_\_

4. How many RPA enforcement actions did the locality undertake for instances where the SMZ criteria were not followed? \_\_\_\_\_

Locality:

5. Did the enforcement actions appropriately require the re-establishment of a 100' vegetated RPA buffer?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

**I. Wetlands Permitting - § 9VAC25-830-9**

1. Does the locality have any adopted Wetlands Board policies or guidelines?

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A (No local Wetlands Board) ☐

2. Does the locality have a process whereby wetlands permits or other applicable equivalent documentation are filed?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

**J. Resource Protection Area Performance Criteria - § 9VAC25-830-140**

1. Does the locality limit permissible development in the RPA to that which is outlined under § 9 VAC 25-830-140 1 of the Regulations?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Can the locality provide documentation or by other means verify that approved development activities in RPAs have met the required criteria?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Does the locality require Water Quality Impact Assessments (WQIAs) to be submitted prior to permitting RPA development activities, including land disturbances and buffer encroachments?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

4. How many RPA development projects were approved during the past 12-18 months?

Water dependent facilities: \_\_\_\_\_

Redevelopment projects: \_\_\_\_\_

Roads and drives: \_\_\_\_\_

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

5. How many WQIAs were reviewed for permitted encroachments or permitted development during the past 12-18 months?

Minor WQIAs: \_\_\_\_\_

Major WQIAs: \_\_\_\_\_

Total WQIAs: \_\_\_\_\_

Locality:

6. Does the locality limit permitted encroachments in the RPA to that which is outlined under § 9 VAC 25-830-140 4 of the Regulations?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

7. How many buffer encroachment projects as permitted under § 9 VAC 25-830-140 4 were **approved** during the past 12-18 months?

Pre-Bay Act lots platted before 10/1/1989: \_\_\_\_\_

Lots platted between 10/1/1989 and 3/2/2002: \_\_\_\_\_

Expansions of existing principal structures: \_\_\_\_\_

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

8. How many buffer encroachment projects were **applied for** during the past 12-18 months?

Pre-Bay Act lots platted before 10/1/1989: \_\_\_\_\_

Lots platted between 10/1/1989 and 3/2/2002: \_\_\_\_\_

Expansions of existing principal structures: \_\_\_\_\_

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

9. Does the review of plan files indicate the locality is properly ensuring that shoreline erosion projects are reviewed for adequate protection of the RPA and the re-establishment of vegetation?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

10. How many wetlands board permits were granted during the previous year? \_\_\_\_\_

Of those, how many were for shoreline erosion control projects? \_\_\_\_\_

How many were denied? \_\_\_\_\_

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

11. Does the locality require a separate permit for land disturbances in excess of 2,500 square feet for those portions of shoreline erosion control or other permitted wetland projects which occur outside of the jurisdiction of the local Wetlands Board?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

12. Does the locality require re-vegetation or other mitigation for land disturbances in the RPA buffer area(s) that are part of shoreline erosion control or other permitted wetland projects?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

13. Describe the locality's mitigation requirements for encroachments as permitted under § 9 VAC25-830-1405 a. \_\_\_\_\_

14. Does the locality have an administrative approval process for permitted RPA buffer encroachments?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If "Yes", describe the administrative approval process: \_\_\_\_\_

15. Does the locality require approval prior to removal of vegetation in the RPA buffer for site lines, access paths, views and vistas?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Type of approval required (i.e. written, verbal, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_

16. Does the locality have a written policy for permitting general woodlot management practices and reasonable sight lines and vistas?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

17. Describe the locality's mitigation requirements for buffer modifications as permitted under § 9 VAC25-830-140 5.

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

18. Does the locality require mitigation and/or replacement of vegetation when buffer vegetation is cleared either with or without prior approval (violations)?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

19. Describe the locality's mitigation requirements for buffer violations.

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **K. Regulatory Relief Mechanisms - § 9VAC25-830-150**

1. Does the locality have an administrative waiver process for reviewing expansions of nonconforming principal structures or building on nonconforming lots as provided for in §§ 9VAC25-830-150 A and 9VAC25-830-150 C 4?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Does the local administrative waiver process for expanding nonconforming principal structures or building on nonconforming lots comply with the requirements listed in §§ 9VAC25-830-150 A and 9VAC25-830-150 C 4?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Does the process include a WQIA requirement for buffer encroachments?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Using the latest Annual Report or other information, how many administrative waivers for nonconforming principal structures and/or lots were granted during the past 12-18 months? \_\_\_\_\_

5. Have the local annual reports or other information indicated a discrepancy between the number of approved waivers and WQIAs?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Were WQIAs reviewed in conjunction with these administrative waivers?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Does the locality have a process for ensuring that projects that are provisionally exempt under § 9VAC25-830-150 B 1 & 2 conform to the requirements in that section?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Does the locality have a review process whereby public utilities are approved consistent with the requirements of the Regulations?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

9. Does the locality track exempted activities listed under § 9VAC25-830-150 B 1?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

10. Using the information from the latest Annual Report or other information, how many formal exceptions to the Regulations were considered and approved during the past 12-18 months? (per § 9VAC25-830-150 C)

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

11. Did the locality require a WQIA for each exception considered?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

12. What board, body, commission or committee reviews and approves Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act exception requests?

☐

BZA

☐

Planning Commission

☐

Council or Board of Supervisors

☐

Other (Wetlands Board, Citizens, Staff, etc.). Please list: \_\_\_\_\_

13. Has the exception process changed since completion of the first compliance evaluation?



Locality:

Yes ☐ No ☐  
Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

14. Does the local exception process, application materials and review process meet all requirements outlined under § 9VAC25-830-150 C?

Yes ☐ No ☐  
Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

15. Does the local exception process include an appeals provision?

Yes ☐ No ☐  
Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

If “Yes”, note who the appeal is sent to and the time frame for appeal submission.

Appeal Body: \_\_\_\_\_

Time Frame: \_\_\_\_\_

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

16. Do the case files involving exceptions include documentation that the exception(s) granted met all the required findings contained in 9VAC25-830-150 C 1?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Do the files indicate that the locality has an appropriate process for the administration of exceptions and that all requirements of the regulations have been applied?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

## **PART IV**

### **Local Program Administration and Enforcement**

---

#### **A. Development Review Mechanisms**

1. Does application materials used during the Plan of Development review process include information necessary to ensure that all Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act program requirements are met?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Attach a copy of the forms used in reviewing applications (checklists, computation sheets, etc.). Is the information collected adequate to ensure that Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act program requirements are met?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

3. If the information requested on the checklists, computation sheets, etc. is inadequate to ensure that Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act program requirements are met, note areas of deficiencies.

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

## B. Complaint Process

1. Does the locality have a written complaint review process?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Have any confirmed violations of the local program resulted in court action?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

If "Yes", what was the result of the court cases?

Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Has the existence of any of the complaints or violations provided any indication of deficiencies in the local program?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Documentation: \_\_\_\_\_

## PART V

### Site Plan Review and Field Investigations

---

#### A. Site Plan and Plan File Reviews

This section should include a list of the plan files reviewed and a summary of the findings noted during the site plan and plan of development file reviews. The list of site plans and plan files reviewed will be taken from the *Site Plan File & Field Review Checklist* for each project and the summary will include an analysis of whether or not the plans and plan files show that the locality is adequately implementing requirements in the following areas:

- Minimizing Land Disturbance
- Preserving Indigenous Vegetation
- Minimizing Impervious Cover
- Permitted Development in RPA
- Permitted Encroachments in the RPA
- Approval of RPA Exceptions

#### B. Site Visits

A summary of the conditions noted during the site visits, including representative photographs, should be included in this section of the *Consolidated Checklist*.

## PART VI

### Meeting Date Summary and Signatures

---

MEETING DATES AND STAFF ATTENDANCE:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Locality:

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE CONSOLIDATED CHECKLIST COMPLETED: \_\_\_\_\_

*Prepared by:*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Locality Liaison

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

*Reviewed by:*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Reviewer

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

## **CHESAPEAKE BAY PRESERVATION ACT**

### **REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF LOCAL PROGRAM COMPLIANCE REVIEWS**

Locality:  
Reviewer:  
Date:

To prepare for the local program Compliance Review process, staff from the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), has assembled information relevant to the **Town/City/County's** Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (CBPA or Bay Act) program, based on submitted Annual Reports, the original Compliance Review, and the **Town/City/County's** advisory review that occurred in **DATE**. **In anticipation of the upcoming compliant review scheduled to begin on DATE, please be prepared to verify that the status of specific program elements noted below by DEQ staff is correct, or provide a summary of the status of the local program elements referenced in this Checklist by DATE.** The information collected will be used by DEQ staff to develop a full understanding of the **Town/City/County's** Bay Act program and will help determine if the **Town/City/County's** program remains in compliance with the requirements of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations (Regulations).

The amount of information and/or documentation required to facilitate the Compliance Review process may depend on the degree to which the local program has changed since the time of the **Town/City/County's** last Compliance Review, completed on **DATE**. If the **Town/City/County's** program elements are essentially unchanged since the date of original compliance, much of the required information referenced below will only need to be verified by DEQ staff during the review process. If administrative processes or other substantive program elements have been changed or eliminated since **DATE**, it is important that local staff provide DEQ staff with specific details of those changes. Complete and accurate information regarding the current status of the local Bay Act program will help facilitate a thorough and effective Compliance Review.

## Elements of Local Program

Item #	Regulatory citation	Information needed for review	Status
1.	9VAC25-830-60 1	Current Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas (CBPA) Map (hard copy and digital data, if available)	<i>Liaison should verify status in advance any note here prior to sending to local contact.</i>
2.	9VAC25-830-60 2, 4, and 5	Current Bay Act Ordinance	<i>Liaison should note adoption date and code citation of ordinance on file, and confirm this is the most current ordinance in use by locality.</i>
3.	9VAC25-830-60 3 and -170	Current comprehensive plan elements addressing the protection of CBPAs and state waters (9 VAC 25-830-170)	<i>Liaison should verify status in advance any note here prior to sending to local contact.</i>
4.	9VAC25-830-60 4	Current Zoning Ordinance	<i>Liaison should verify status in advance any note here prior to sending to local contact.</i>
5.	9VAC25-830-60 5	Current Subdivision Ordinance	<i>Liaison should verify status in advance any note here prior to sending to local contact.</i>
6.	9VAC25-830-60 7 and -130 3	Description of plan of development (POD) review process.	<i>Liaison should summarize process on file and note here prior to sending to local contact.</i>

## Comprehensive Plan Requirements

Item #	Regulatory citation	Information needed for review	Status
7.	9VAC25-830-170	Verification that the current comprehensive plan includes all required elements	<i>Liaison should verify status in advance any note here prior to sending to local contact.</i>
8.	9VAC25-830-170	Summary description of how the local government ensures that comprehensive plan data and policies adopted pursuant to Bay Act requirements are reviewed and updated as needed to ensure they remain current.	<i>Please provide a written statement describing how Petersburg ensures that data and policies adopted pursuant to comprehensive plan requirements are reviewed and updated as needed to ensure they remain current. In other words, how does the City ensure the Comprehensive Plan stays current? Have conditions changed that require data and policies to be reviewed and updated, e.g., changing shoreline conditions.</i>

9.	9VAC25-830-260 1 b	Summary description of how the local government implements required Bay Act components of the comprehensive plan and the status of that implementation.	<i>Please provide a written statement describing how Petersburg implements Bay Act components of the comprehensive plan. In other words, how does the City use the Comprehensive Plan during implementation of its CBPA program, e.g. during POD review, site plan review, subdivision review, etc.?</i>
----	--------------------	---	--

### Land Use and Development Performance Criteria

Item #	Regulatory citation	Information needed for review	Status
10.	9VAC25-830-130 1, 2, 4	Summary of Advisory Review ordinance provisions and/or policies that minimize land disturbance, protect indigenous vegetation and minimize impervious cover.	<i>Liaison should summarize Advisory Review information in advance and note here.</i>
11.	9VAC25-830-130 5	Explanation of how the locality meets state-mandated Erosion and Sediment Control requirements (i.e. does the locality have its own Ordinance or does another locality do ESC for them?).	<i>Liaison should note adoption date of ordinance and code citation on file – confirm this is the most current ordinance in use by locality.</i>
12.	9VAC25-830-130 5	Where applicable, documentation that the local government's E&S control program is consistent with state requirements.	<i>Liaison should determine status in advance and note here.</i>
13.	9VAC25-830-130 7	Verification that all required septic tank notices have been sent, and that local follow up and enforcement actions have been undertaken, as necessary.	<i>Using Annual Report information or other information, liaison should note status in advance and note here prior to sending to local contact. Local staff should be prepared to provide summary of follow up and enforcement.</i>
14.	9VAC25-830-130 8	Verification that the local government has a plan for ensuring that all active CBPA agricultural lands have a current conservation assessment.	<i>Local staff should provide implementation plan for how local government will ensure requirement will be met and should note actions taken toward implementation of plan.</i>
15.	9VAC25-830-130 9	Verification that the local government has enforcement process for RPA violations where DOF silvicultural BMPs have not been followed.	<i>Liaison should summarize process in advance and note here.</i>
16.	9VAC25-830-130 10	Verification that the local government requires, where	<i>Local staff should provide status of how requirement for proof of wetlands permits</i>

		appropriate, evidence of wetlands permits prior to allowing grading or other on-site activities to begin.	<i>is consistently met.</i>
--	--	---	-----------------------------

## RPA Performance Criteria Information

Item #	Regulatory citation	Information needed for review	Status
17.	9VAC25-830-140 1	Verification that the local government's process for properly ensuring that only permitted uses and activities are allowed in the RPA remains consistent.  (Permitted uses: water dependent structures; redevelopment; expansions of non-conforming <b>principal</b> structures; lots recorded prior to 10-1-89; "tweener" lots if allowed by local ordinance)	<i>Liaison should summarize process in advance and note here.</i>
18.	9VAC25-830-140 2	Verification that the local government's process for reviewing administrative approvals for exempt activities in RPAs remains consistent.	<i>Liaison should summarize process in advance and note here.</i>
19.	9VAC25-830-140 3 b	Verification that the local government is implementing a process for ensuring the re-establishment of RPA buffers when land is converted from agricultural or silvicultural use to other uses.	<i>Liaison should summarize process in advance and note here.</i>
20.	9VAC25-830-140 4	Verification that the local government's process for reviewing permitted RPA encroachments remains consistent.	<i>Liaison should summarize process in advance and note here.</i>
21.	9VAC25-830-190 A 4	Verification that the local government has adopted ordinance provisions noted during the Advisory Review that ensure, through the plan of development review process, that the plat and site plan requirements are consistently met.	<i>Liaison should summarize information from Advisory Review in advance and note here.</i>
22.	9VAC25-190 A 5	Verification that the local government has adopted ordinance provisions noted during the Advisory Review of provisions to ensure,	<i>Liaison should summarize Advisory Review information in advance and note here.</i>

		through the plan of development review process, that the delineation of buildable areas requirement for approved site plans is consistently met.	
23.	9VAC25-830-140 5 a	Verification that the local process for reviewing and approving buffer modifications remains consistent (Buffer modifications: removal of vegetation for sightlines and vistas; access paths; woodlot management; and shoreline erosion control structures).	<i>Liaison should summarize process in advance and note here.</i>
24.	9VAC25-830-140 5 b 1-2	Verification that the local government has records of recent SWCD approved practices in support of RPA encroachments for agricultural uses.	<i>Local staff must provide documentation regarding approval of any recent agricultural practices in support of buffer encroachments.</i>
25.	9VAC25-830-140 5 b 4	Verification that the local government, working with the local SWCD, has a process for addressing agricultural pollution issues.	<i>Local staff must demonstrate that they have a process in place to addressing agricultural pollution issues.</i>
26.	9VAC25-830-140- 6	Verification that the local government has procedures to ensure that water quality impact assessments (WQIAs) are being required for all applicable activities in RPAs.	<i>Liaison should summarize process in advance and note here.</i>

### Regulatory Relief Mechanisms

Item #	Regulatory citation	Information needed for review	Status
27.	9VAC25-830-150 A	Verification that the local government's administrative waiver process for the approval of non-conforming lots or structures in RPAs remains consistent.	<i>Liaison should summarize process in advance and note here.</i>
28.	9VAC25-830-150 B	Verification that the local government's process for the approval of exempt public utilities, railroads, public roads and facilities remains consistent.	<i>Liaison should summarize process in advance and note here.</i>
29.	9VAC25-830-150 C	Verification that the local government's process for reviewing and approving exceptions remains consistent.	<i>Liaison should summarize process in advance and note here.</i>



## **Program Administration and Enforcement Forms**

If any of the following forms or documents are used in the administration of the local Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act program, local staff should provide DEQ staff with a copy:

1. Building permit application
2. Erosion and Sediment Control Permit (land disturbing permit)
3. Notice of RPA violation (unauthorized removal of vegetation, unauthorized land disturbance or construction of structure, driveway, pool, etc.)
4. Any applicable documents used by the local government in support of the POD review process:
  - a. POD Review Checklist
  - b. Site plan development flow chart
  - c. WQIA checklist or form
  - d. Perennial Flow Determination forms
  - e. Landscape plan checklist
  - f. RPA development checklist
5. Any other materials representative of the local Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act program.



Project Name/Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Type/Description: \_\_\_\_\_

Wetlands Specialist: \_\_\_\_\_

Locality: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **RPA DETERMINATION REVIEW CHECKLIST**

### **Site Plan and File Review**

1. Site-specific RPA Determination conducted by:  
Applicant \_\_\_\_\_ Locality \_\_\_\_\_ Consultant \_\_\_\_\_
2. Date locality approved/accepted RPA Determination: \_\_\_\_\_
3. RPA and RMA boundaries are shown on submitted plans. Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_\_
  - a. RPA features, when present, appear to be properly depicted. Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_\_
  - b. A 100' buffer has been measured from the inland limit of all required RPA features.  
Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_\_
  - c. Describe any observed mapping deficiencies: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Where required, Waters of the U.S. and jurisdictional wetlands have been confirmed by the ACOE and shown on submitted plans. Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_\_
  - a. Date of ACOE confirmation: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Submitted plans identify nontidal wetlands not protected by RPA buffer:  
Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_\_
  - a. If yes, describe the documentation provided that demonstrates the wetlands are not an RPA feature requiring the 100-foot buffer: \_\_\_\_\_
6. A Perennial Flow Determination (PFD) was conducted for all water bodies on, and adjacent to, the development site. Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_\_
  - a. The PFD was conducted using the NC \_\_\_\_\_ Fairfax \_\_\_\_\_ James City \_\_\_\_\_ protocol
  - b. Name of individual/consulting firm conducting the PFD: \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. If a PFD was not conducted for all water bodies on or adjacent to the development site, explain why it was not necessary. \_\_\_\_\_
7. A wetland delineation for nontidal wetlands connected by surface flow and contiguous to water bodies with perennial flow was conducted: Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_\_
  - a. Date wetland delineation conducted: \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Name of individual/consulting firm conducting the wetland delineation: \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. If a wetland delineation was not submitted, explain why it was deemed not necessary. \_\_\_\_\_
8. The site-specific RPA Determination did \_\_\_\_\_ did not \_\_\_\_\_ result in adjustments to the adopted CBPA map.
  - a. Describe any map adjustments that were made and the findings that made adjustments necessary. \_\_\_\_\_

9. The site-specific RPA Determination has been verified in the field and adjustments to the adopted map have been approved by the locality. Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_
10. In the event that an RPA encroachment is proposed, has a WQIA of sufficient specificity been submitted to enable staff to make the following determinations:
  - a. Identify the impacts of the proposed development on water quality and RPA lands.  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Determine specific measures for mitigation of those impacts. \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Demonstrate compliance with local program criteria. \_\_\_\_\_
11. Describe the mitigation as proposed on the WQIA and/or submitted plans. \_\_\_\_\_
12. At a minimum, does the proposed mitigation meet Buffer Manual recommendations?  
Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_
  - a. If not, what improvements are recommended? \_\_\_\_\_

### **Field Review**

1. The field verification of the RPA appears to conform to the RPA boundaries shown on the approved plans. Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_
  - a. Describe any deviations to RPA boundaries on submitted plans found in the field.  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. The field investigation identified evidence of streams, water bodies, or other RPA features not shown on the plans. Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_
  - a. Describe additional findings, and any additional studies that should be conducted.  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. The RPA buffer as depicted on the approved plans was intact and undisturbed as of the date of the field investigation. Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_
4. Indigenous vegetation has been preserved to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the proposed use or development. Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_
5. As installed, the combination of intact RPA and/or vegetative mitigation meets Bay Act water quality protection criteria, e.g. is effective in retarding runoff, preventing erosion, and filtering nonpoint source pollution. Y \_\_\_ N\_\_\_ N/A\_\_\_
  - a. Describe additional recommended mitigation measures, if any, which are necessary to meet Bay Act requirements. \_\_\_\_\_

**PROVIDE PHOTOS OF RPA FEATURES, WITH NOTED  
OBSERVATIONS, AND DOCUMENTATION OF SITE-SPECIFIC RPA  
DETERMINATION**



Project: \_\_\_\_\_

Locality: \_\_\_\_\_

Liaison: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**LOCAL CHESAPEAKE BAY PRESERVATION ACT PROGRAM  
COMPLIANCE REVIEW  
SITE PLAN FILE & FIELD REVIEW CHECKLISTS**

**Type of Project:** \_\_\_\_\_

**General Information**

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date/Type of Approval: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Description: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Section 1: General Site Plan and File Information**

1. Existing site conditions. Y N N/A

Describe: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Location and description of all existing and proposed on-site sewage disposal systems, including reserve drainfields. Y N N/A
3. Delineation or description of buildable area, required setbacks and any other relevant easements or limitations regarding lot coverage. Y N N/A
4. Land disturbance over 2,500 square feet was evaluated through a POD process (site plan or subdivision plan). Y N N/A
5. Copies of Virginia Water Protection Permits necessary to disturb wetlands are present on the plans or in the files. Y N N/A
6. Additional comments:

Project: \_\_\_\_\_

Locality: \_\_\_\_\_

Liaison: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Section 2: Required Plat Notations**

1. Notation regarding the requirement to retain an undisturbed and vegetated 100-foot wide buffer area. Y N N/A
2. Notation regarding the requirement for pump-out for on-site sewage treatment systems. Y N N/A
3. Notation regarding the requirement for 100 % reserve drainfield sites. Y N N/A
4. Notation that permitted development in the RPA is limited to water dependent facilities or redevelopment, including the 100-foot wide vegetated buffer. Y N N/A
5. Additional comments:

## **Section 3: Resource Protection Area Requirements**

1. Only permitted uses in the RPA are shown. Y N N/A
2. Buffer encroachment on pre-1989 lot. Y N N/A
3. Buffer encroachment on lot recorded between October 1, 1989 and March 1, 2002. Y N N/A
4. Did the locality require a WQIA for this project? Y N N/A
5. If project involves conversion from agricultural or silvicultural land, was buffer reestablishment required? Y N N/A
6. Is this a shoreline erosion control project? Y N N/A
7. Shoreline erosion control techniques chosen are based on best available technical advice from \_\_\_\_\_.
8. Was an RPA exception approved for this project? Y N N/A
9. Does this project involve buffer mitigation? Y N N/A
10. Was there a RPA violation on the site? Y N N/A
11. Additional comments:

Project: \_\_\_\_\_

Locality: \_\_\_\_\_

Liaison: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Section 4: Performance Criteria #1, 2 and 5**

##### *Limiting Land Disturbance*

1. Existing and proposed topography shown. Y N N/A
2. Limits of clearing and grading are shown on plan. Y N N/A
3. Proposed limits of clearing and grading include the entire lot or parcel. Y N N/A
4. Proposed construction footprint and limits of clearing and grading are the same. Y N N/A
5. Does the extent of approved land disturbance appear to exceed that which was necessary for the project? Y N N/A If yes, describe: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Additional comments:

##### *Preserving Existing Vegetation*

7. Does the plan show existing vegetation? Y N N/A
8. Describe existing vegetation: \_\_\_\_\_
9. Does the plan show existing vegetation to remain? Y N N/A  
If yes, describe vegetation to be preserved: \_\_\_\_\_
10. Does the plan show method of protection of vegetation? Y N N/A
11. Does the plan show preservation of vegetation outside of limits of clearing, grading or construction footprint? Y N N/A
12. Additional comments:

##### *Limiting Impervious Cover*

13. Proposed construction footprint shows location of all driveways, parking areas, and other impervious surfaces, with indication of the type of surface. Y N N/A
14. Required parking spaces: \_\_\_\_\_
15. Number of parking spaces provided: \_\_\_\_\_

Project: \_\_\_\_\_

Locality: \_\_\_\_\_

Liaison: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

16. Maximum parking spaces required: \_\_\_\_\_

17. Minimum Parking space size: \_\_\_\_\_

18. Size of parking spaces approved: \_\_\_\_\_

19. Is pervious pavement used for any of the required parking? Y N

20. Does the proposed project involve a parking structure? Y N

21. What is the proposed total impervious coverage for this project? \_\_\_\_\_sq ft (or **acres**)  
and \_\_\_\_\_%

22. List elements that are included in the impervious cover for this project:  
\_\_\_\_\_

23. Does the amount of impervious coverage appear to exceed that which was necessary for the project? Y N N/A If yes, describe: \_\_\_\_\_

24. Additional comments:

### **Field Review**

1. Structures or modifications are built or are under development as they are shown on approved plan(s). Y N N/A
2. If there are discrepancies between the approved plan and what was built or disturbed, is the locality aware of this? Y N N/A  
If yes, how has this been addressed? \_\_\_\_\_
3. RPA has been permanently marked on site (if required by the locality's ordinance).  
Y N N/A
4. RPA has been temporarily marked on site (if required by the locality's ordinance).  
Y N N/A
5. Limits of construction and land disturbance are being adhered to. Y N N/A
6. Erosion and sediment control devices are in place, consistent with the approved plan, and appear to be functioning properly. Y N N/A



Project: \_\_\_\_\_

Locality: \_\_\_\_\_

Liaison: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Reserve drainfield site is unencumbered with improvements. Y N N/A
8. Any required mitigation or buffer restoration is properly in place and in accordance with plans. Y N N/A

**(COPY ALL PHOTOS INTO THIS DOCUMENT)**